I will request the Hon'ble Members to join me in condemning the incidents in strongest terms and conveying our deepest sympathies to the bereaved families. We all share their grief.

In order to contain terrorism, the number of police control room vehicles has been increased to 165 round the clock. 100 pickets armed with automatic weapons and wireless sets have been posted at strategic points. The intelligence machinery has been geared up. Close vigil is being maintained. The Army has been asked to stand by in the sensitive areas of the city.

Section 144 has been imposed in the whole of Delhi.

I will appeal to all Hon'ble Members to assist in maintaining harmony and peace. The Government will leave no stone unturned to apprehend the culprits and deal with them deterently.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up Private Members' Legislative Business. Now there are two Bills for introduction. The first one is the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1987, to be introduced by Mr. Chitta Basu. He is not here now. The second Bill, the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, 1987, is also in his name. He is not present. We shall now continue the discussion on the Betwa River Board (Amendment) Bill, 1985. On the last occasion, Mr. Vithalbhai Patel was on his legs and he is to continue now.

THE BETWA RIVER BOARD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985-Contd.

श्री विट्ठलभाई मोतीराम पटेल (गुजरात) : उपसभापति महोदया, बेतवा रिवर बोर्ड के पास पैसे नहीं होने से इसमें काफी विलंब हो गया और इस पर खर्चा भी काफी बढ़ गया । तो सरकार को यह देखना चाहिए कि जो काम पांच साल पहले खत्म करना था वह यदि आगे चलता ही रहता है तो इससे उसका खर्चा बढ़ जाता है । बेतवा रिवर के लिए जब खर्चा 200 करोड़ से ज्यादा होगा और अगर राज्य सरकार देती भी है तो राज्य सरकार को बुलाकर बोलना चाहिए कि आप अपना हिस्सा दे दीजिए । अब मुझे पता चला है कि सिंचाई मंत्री जी ने उत्तरप्रदेश और मध्यप्रदेश की सरकार से मशविरा कर के कुछ फंड कायम करने के लिए उनको कहा है । तो इसका काम कुछ आगे चलेगा । लेकिन काफी विलंब होने से जो योजना कम खर्चे में पूरी होने वाली थी वह काफी बढ़ जाती है । अब आगे जो नयी योजना बनती है जिसमें अलग-अलग स्टेट वाले ज्वाइन होते हैं, उसमें विलंब न हो इसके लिए मंत्रीजी को देखना चाहिए । आज नर्मदा सागर की जो योजना है उसमें गुजरात, मध्यप्रदेश, राजस्थान, महाराष्ट्र—चार स्टेट हैं । तो वह योजना भी पहले 500 करोड़ की थी जोकि अब 12 हजार करोड़ की हो गयी है । तो यह विलंब जितना होगा उतना खर्चा ज्यादा होगा । अतः मैं मंत्रीजी से विनती करता हूं कि आग जितनी एसी योजनायें हों जिनमें दो-चार स्टेटस हों तो यह पहले से तय किया जाय कि वह कितना फंड देंगी और नहीं देतीं तो देने के लिए कहिए और उसमें विलंब न हो इसके लिए खास ध्यान रखिए । खासकर के नर्मदा योजना के बारे में मंत्रीजी पहले से ही कुछ करलें जिससे कि उसके काम में विलंब न हो, रुके नहीं । मेरा

[श्री विट्ठल भाई मोती राम पटेल]

यही कहना था कि आगे से ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि जो काम पांच साल पहले खत्म करना था वह दस साल पीछे भी खत्म नहीं होता तो इसके लिए मंत्रीजी ध्यान रखें । धन्यवाद ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the honourable Minister.

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): Madam Deputy Chair-person, this debate in this House has been going on for some time. The main complaint of the Members seems to be that there has been delay in the construction of the dam and the implementation of the entire programme. You will kindly appreciate, Madam, and the House may like to know that for any project, whether it is an irrigation project or a power project, the basic development of the project requires Vitamin 'M', and without that perhaps no project can take shape. By 'Vitamin-M' I mean the money.

Now, if you go through the history of this Act which is presently sought to be amended by the hon. Member, Mr. Richharia who is sitting here, who is a very senior Member of this House...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One minute, please. Since no Member on the Panel is present, I will request Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan to take the Chair for some time.

[**The vice Chairman (Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan)** in the Chair.]

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Madam, I was just explaining as to how a project can be implemented.

With regard to Betwa, perhaps the very Act which came into existence in the year 1976, will go to show that the States involved in this particular project, namely, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, made the Government of India to take up their responsibility of constructing this dam. As the Preamble of the Act says, this Act was enacted to provide for the establishment of a Board for the creation of a reservoir at Rajghat by construction on behalf of the Governments of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh of a dam on the Betwa river at Rajghat and for the regulation of such reservoir.

Now, let us not confuse ourselves. The responsibility taken up by the Government of India on behalf of these States is only with respect to the construction of a dam, and not the entire project. We have to create a reservoir and construct a dam. In the Schedule to the Act it is stated:

> "The Dam is to be built across the Betwa River about one furlong upstream of Lalitpur Chanderi causeway at Rajghat on the River Betwa District Lalitpur of Uttar Pradesh. The Dam will comprise a masonry section in the river bed and earthern flanks on both sides. It will also include the earth dam to be constructed in the saddles on either side for creating a reservoir."

This is to what the Betwa River Board is applicable.

Now, though the Act was passed in 1976 and there was some amendment in 1977, the actual Board was constituted in the year 1978, and thereafter the actual construction work started in the year 1981. Madam Chairperson, the requirement of funds for this was of the order of Rs. 153.50 crores. The contribution by the States was to the extent of Rs. 67.31 crores only. The House can find that there was a shortfall of about Rs. 66 crores. The main delay in the implementation or the construction of the dam which the hon. Members have complained about was because of shortage of funds. There is no provision in the Act about

this non-funding aspect. Perhaps the Members may say that this is the very purpose for which this amendment has been sought. Madam, if you look at the amendment sought by the hon. Member, Shri Richharia, through this Betwa River Board Amendment Bill, 1985, you will find that it seeks to add a provision to Section 13(1) of the Act which says that there shall be constituted a fund to be called the Betwa River Board Fund. The money shall be paid to the Board by the Governments of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. Now it has been our experience so far that the two States have been very slow in providing funds for this purpose. It is because of this that the work has suffered and there has been delay. Naturally, it is going to result in cost escalation.

The Members have sought to authorise the Government of India to recover funds from both the State Governments. Section 13, Sub-section (1) of the present Bill states "provided that it shall be the responsibility of the Central Government to collect the sum payable to the Board by the said State Governments and credit the same to the fund". I can appreciate the anxiety of the hon. Members which has led them to introduce this Bill and to support this Bill. As far as their anxiety for early and quick implementation of the project is concerned, I do support them. But I will explain as to why this amendment cannot be accepted. Madam, the projects, especially the irrigation projects, are planned, funded and implemented by the States. This is a joint project of the States of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. So far as the construction of the dam is concerned, the Centre has taken the responsibility on their behalf. But it is for the States to fund it. If they are slow to fund or if their priorities do not permit them to fund it, then the construction work through the Betwa River Board also slows down. I myself had a meeting with both the States in the year 1985. And in the meeting, Madam, they have agreed to provide Rs. 50 crores each during the Seventh Plan. And by this we expect to complete the implementation or construction of the dam by 1991-92. The backlog of Rs. 8 crores accumulated till the end of the Sixth Plan was already agreed to be provided by the Government of Madhya Pradesh. The proposed allocation during the remaining three years of the Seventh Plan are as under:

1987-88: Madhya Pradesh has agreed to contribute Rs. 11.50 crores and U.P. an equal sum. The total comes to Rs. 23 crores.

1988-89: The estimated contribution by Madhya Pradesh is Rs. 15 crores and U.P. Rs. 11.50 crores. The total is Rs. 26.50 crores.

1989-90: The estimated contribution of Madhya Pradesh is Rs. 17 crores and U.P. has to contribute Rs. 8.50 crores, amounting to Rs. 25.50 crores.

Thus, Madam, we hope to complete the construction by 1991-92 and we hope also that the State Governments will keep up their promise of contributing their shares. The progress of construction of the Rajghat dam is about 50 per cent and by the year 1889-90 the total anticipated cost is likely to go up to Rs. 175.85 crores. I can inform the House, Madam, that the progress of the contruction of the dam till now, earthen portion, is almost 90 per cent completed, masonry dam 30 per cent, power house construction which is apart of the project—not yet started. The State Governments have also undertaken as per their respective State Plans construction of canals in the command area of this project out of which about 30 per cent of the work has been completed.

Madam, hon. Members have sought to raise many issues which are not entirey relevant to the debate for the purpose of amending the Act. They have travelled to areas which I do not think are relevant for the purposes of the present Bill and where I do not think I should take up the time of the House. They are relevant to the irrigation aspect of the country, not quite relevant to the purpose of the amending Bill.

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

Madam, as I have said, the anticipated expenditure of the construction of the dam is likely to go up from about Rs. 175.85 crores. The balance amount of Rs. 46.15 crores will have to be contributed equally by the two States during the remaining years of the Plan as the total cost of this project is estimated to be Rs.222 crores. May I tell the Hon. Member who has introduced this Bill and the Members who have supported the Bill that in both the States there are a number of on-going irrigation projects. The position is that in Madhya Pradesh there are 60 on-going projects and the spill-over cost of these on-going projects is Rs. 3,371 crores as far as Madhya Pradesh is concerned. And they have only provided in the Seventh Plan an amount of Rs. 1376 crores as against the spill-over cost of Rs. 3371 crores. In U. P., they have 44 on-going projects and the spill-over cost for these projects is Rs. 1527 crores. As against this, the provision made by U.P. State Government in their Seventh Plan is Rs. 1020 crores. The House may see that there is a large gap in the provision of funds even for implementation of the on going projects, in the Seventh Five-Year Plan, and necessarily there is going to be a spill-over in the Eighth Plan also. In spite of this, implementation of a project depends upon participation of respective State Governments. That will enthuse the State Governments to contribute to the implementation of the projects. I hope the State Governments have agreed to contribute Rs. 50 crores each for implementation of the project during this period. If we see the progress of year-wise contribution by the States, it creates a hope in the mind and we hope to complete this project.

Madam, I need not go into the details. I can only say that looking to the figures of the contributions of the States, perhaps we hope to complete this project.

I do not think there is any other point left to be replied except that hon. Members have expressed their grievance against the slow implementation of the project, and I think I have made myself clear about the entire position. In view of the fact that both the State Government have generated enough hope of their ability to contribute, and the River Board's ability to implement this by 1990-91, and in the overall scheme of provision of funds by State Government for implementation of the respective projects, I do not think the House will be able to accept this amendment, I therefore, request the hon. Member that he may consider to withdraw the Bill.

I can assure him and the House that I would still continue my efforts to persuade the State Governments for their contribution of funds in time, and also the Board to complete the project.

Thank you.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जब इस पर विवाद हो रहा था तो उसी वक्त ये बातें जाहिर कर दी गई थीं कि राज्य सरकारें इसमें दिलचस्पी नहीं ले रही हैं और जो इतनी देर तक यह योजना लटकी रही यह राज्य सरकारों की उपेक्षा या एक दूसरे के ऊपर डिपैन्ड रहने पर हुई। इसलिये उस वक्त केन्द्र सरकार से, सिंचाई विभाग से यह मांग की गई थी कि आप इस योजना को अपने हाथ में लें और राज्य सरकारों से उनका हिस्सा अपने आप लें तथा केन्द्रीय सरकार इस योजना को जल्दी पूरी करे। इसकी जो लाभ-हानियां हैं वह डिटेल में उस दिन कही गई थीं। लेकिन आज मंत्री जी बता रहे हैं, मैं जहां तक समझ पाया हूं कि वे अभी भी राज्य सरकारों की तरफ से पूर्णतः आश्वासित नहीं हैं। उन्होंने स्वयं यह कहा है कि मैं कोशिश करूंगा कि राज्य सरकारें इस पर अमल करें और अपना हिस्सा दें। तो मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसी संदिग्ध अवस्था में योजना नहीं रहनी चाहिए। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि उस दिन जो अनेक माननीय सदस्यों ने मांग रखी थी कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इसको सीधे अपने हाथ में

ले । उसमें मंत्री जी की क्या राय है । यह मामला अब 1991–92 तक चला जाएगा यानी आठवीं योजना तक जाएगा। मिट्टी का काम शुरू हो गया है । मिट्टी तो फिर बह जाएगी । फिर दोबारा डालेंगे । फिर रेट बढ़ जाएंगे । ठेकेदार कहेगा कि रेट बढ़ गये तो यह सारा मामला हम तो भुक्तभोगी हैं हम जानते हैं वहां जो हालत हो रही है यह योजना पूरी नहीं होगी । इसको यदि केन्द्रीय सरकार सीधे अपनी देखरेख में नहीं लेगी तो यह योजना पूरी नहीं होगी । आप राज्य सरकारों से हिस्सा ले सकते हैं अपना हिस्सा भी दे सकते हैं क्योंकि देश की अन्य योजनायें भी केन्द्रीय सरकार चला रही है तो फिर अपना हिस्सा दे कर के राज्य सरकारें जो मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश की हैं उनका हिस्सा ले कर आप कितने दिनों तक इस योजना को पूरा करायेंगे मैं आपसे इस बात का स्पष्ट आश्वासन चाहता हूं । फिर प्रस्तावक महोदय जो हैं वह भी इस पर विचार कर लें । मेरा जो निजी अनुभव इस योजना के बारे में है वह मैंने आपके सामने रखा है ।

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Madam, I would say, the hon. Member's demand only shows his earnest anxiety in regard to the implementation of the project. But we should also take into account the plan formulation of the State Governments, the provision of funds for irrigation and the role of the Government of India, the Ministry of Finance and the Planning Commission, who have not supported this sort of action which is sought to be taken through this Bill.

श्री राम चन्द्र विकल : यह पूरा आपको सौंप रहे हैं ।

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: The question is one of financial management as well as provision of funds by the State Governments for the respective sectors. The annual plans and the five-year plans do not have provision for this sort of action, to take up the entire responsibility of collecting funds from the State Governments and then spend it through the Central Government. Of course, there are ways and means. If we can earmark funds for this project at the time of Plan formulation, perhaps, that will bring a little pressure on the State Governments for the early completion of the project. I can inform the hon. Member that we are having this exercise done.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR (Bihar): Madam, with your permission, I would like to seek a clarification from the hon. Minister. The issue which has been raised by hon. Members is whether there is any thinking on the part of the Government in regard to the rivers which flow through more than one State, to have proper management of the water resources, better feasibility report, construction, maintenance and other aspects as well as the multi-purpose use of the water, including electricity. I am mentioning this because of what has been stated in the annual report of the Ministry of Water Resources. It has been stated" A new direction has been given so far as water management is concerned.' Then, it says ' The Ministry of Water Resources has been created exclusively to look after all aspects of water resources and its management; conservation, preservation, cleanliness, utilisation, availability, avoidance of wasteful water as well as proper costing, implementation of the projects etc. are the new aspects which the Ministry is looking into." These are the new aspects which the Ministry is looking into, which is a policy decision, as per the annual report of the Ministry. In this context, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government would consider financing such projects which are useful from the national point of view. Water resources are very important for the country. With all the expertise and taking into account the objectives outlined and the resources at the command of the Government, In spite of the fact that irrigation is a State subject. I would like to know whether important inter-State projects will be taken up by the Government of India so that the projects could be completed on time and water resources could better be made available to the States.

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

I want to seek one more clarification and that is this. The Seventh Five Year Plan has made a mention about the delay in implementation of not only this project but many other projects in several States. In table 21.1 of the Seventh Plan document it is said, I quote:

"Major and medium irrigation: Magnitude of projects approved and under implementation at the beginning of 1984-85 (thousand h.a. of potential) — 15,940, additions 820. The total comes to 16,760."

Then the document says, I quote:

"Number of years required to complete approved projects at 1984-85 rate of completion - 19 years."

This is the main plan document which has stated like this. If the existing on-going projects are to take 19 years for completion, then this is a matter for concern. What special arrangements have been made by the Government to ensure that the on-going projects are completed at the earliest? In this connection, I would again like to quote from the document which says:

"This trend will be curbed by the strategy being followed in the Seventh Plan of concentrating on completion of project as the first priority and stricter criteria for new investments".

So, to what extent this has been done and to what extent this period of 19 years is going to be reduced, to what extent the priorities which have been there in the pipelines and which have a lot of potential for irrigation are going to be achieved this is what I want to know. What steps have been taken by the Government to get the medium and major projects in different States completed in time? Already we are facing severe drought in many parts of the country. Bigger projects have bigger dimension. So, I would like to know, what steps are being taken by the Government on war-footing to complete these projects in time?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Madam, though I am able to reply to the observations made by the hon Member, I may inform the House through you that the clarifications sought by the hon. Member are not at all based on the subject matter in the Bill.

SHRI RAMESHWAR THAKUR: Madam, I raised the issue because as the Betwa River project is being delayed, there are various other projects in different States which are being delayed. They are very much relevant to this. I would like to know whether there is a Government policy about the projects which affect more than one State. Will they be sponsored by the Central Government, or by the States or jointly by the Centre and the States? I do not think these questions are not concerned with this subject matter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): I think the Minister has made the position clear. He has said whatever he had to say.

SHRI RMESHWAR THAKUR: If the Minister has no answer at the moment, it is a different matter.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I did not say that the hon. Member has made no observat on of importance. If it was a general debate on water resource development, perhaps the observations would have been more relevant. But as I said, today the Bill that is being discussed speaks of adding a provision in section 13 of the Betwa River Board (Amendment) Bill, 1985.

I do not think it has anything to do with the legal provision which is sought to be introduced and sought to be accepted by the Government. I do not think there is anything in the observations made by the hon. Member which needs clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): I call upon Dr. Govind Das Richharia to reply.

डा० गोविन्द दास रिछारिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मंत्री जी और साथियों, यह तो निश्चित तौर से हम भी जानते हैं और सदन भी जानता है कि हम लोग, शासक दल के जो सदस्य हैं, वह जब कोई प्रस्ताव लाते हैं, तो उसका उद्देश्य अपने मंत्री और अपने सभी अधिकारियों का ध्यान आकर्षण होता है और मैं ऐसा मानता हूं कि मंत्री जी के उत्तर से, उनका ध्यान आकर्षित हुआ है हमारे इस प्रस्ताव लाने से और मेरा उद्देश्य पूरा हो गया । लेकिन मैं उनसे चाहता यह हूं कि आगे हमारे देश के अन्दर चाहे नर्मदा का प्रोजैक्ट बनाना पड़े, चाहे उनको कावेरी का प्रोजैक्ट बनाना पड़े, चाहे उनको अन्य जितनी नदियां हैं, उनके भी जो बांध बनाने पड़ें, जो भी प्रोजैक्ट तैयार करने पड़े , वह यह ध्यान रखें कि पहले सिंचाई मंत्रालय था, अब इसका नाम जल संसाधन मंत्रालय हो गया । तो आप सम्पूर्ण जल के मालिक हैं ।

आप यह मत सोचिए कि जल की जिम्मेदारी सिर्फ प्रदेशों की है । यही गलती है जो मूलभूत गलती हमारे विधान में रह गई है । मुझे आपसे निवेदन करना है, जैसे आपने कहा कि राजघाट बांध आप पूरा करवा देंगे 1990-91 तक, वह मैं आपके ऊपर उत्तरदायित्व समझता हूं और वहां जो सूखे की स्थिति है, वहां पर जो नुकसान अब तक हुआ वहां के किसानों ने जो अब तक बर्दाश्त किया है, आगे उसका आप ध्यान रखेंगे । अब भी कहीं ऐसा न हो कि आपका यह आश्वासन झूठा पड़े, इसका भी आप ध्यान रखने की कृपा करें । लेकिन यह अवश्य मैं आपसे चाहता हूं कि आप ध्यान रखें कि देश में जमीन बड़ी नहीं है, पानी जो बरसता है, वह भी आपको इस तरह से इस्तेमाल करना है कि वह बाढ़ों में खराब न होकर, जो बाढ़ों में पानी खराब होता है, उसको आप सूखे के क्षेत्र में भेजने की कृपा करें।

इसी तरह से जो आपकी सिंचाई होती है, वह भी इस तरह से समन्वित की जाए, आपकी बिजली की योजनायें बनती हैं, वह भी उन नदियों पर जो दो से अधिक प्रदेशों से बहती हैं, वह इस तरह से बने । इस तरह से आप उसकी व्यवस्था करें कि जिससे बिजली आप सारे देश को बगैर किसी भेद-भाव के आबादी के हिसाब से उनको बंटवारा कर सकें । अगर आप इस तरह से प्लानिंग नहीं करेंगे, तो निश्चित तौर से आपके प्लानिंग, और बाद में आपको उसमें असुविधायें दिखाई देंगी ।

इसलिए मुझे आपसे यही निवेदन करना है कि अपने प्रस्ताव का उद्देश्य पूरा हो गया । आपने जो आश्वासन दिया है, उसको देखते हुए, अपना उद्देश्य पूरा मानते हुए, मैं अपने प्रस्ताव को तो वापिस करता हूं, लेकिन आपसे यही चाहता हूं, और यह आशा करता हूं कि आगे जितनी हमारी बड़ी नदियां हैं, उनका सारा पानी आप इस राष्ट्र की भूमि को सिंचाई देने के लिए इस्तेमाल कर सकें । हमारा सारा पानी जितना बरसता है, जो ईश्वरीय सम्पत्ति है, उसका भी आप बिजली बनाने में इस्तेमाल कर सकें और वह बिजली की शक्ति हमारे सारे देश के निर्माण में और गरीबी मिटाने के लिए सारे देश में उसको भेज सकें । इस तरीके से आपकी योजनाएं बनें और आप अब यह स्वीकार कर लें कि यह जल, यह ईश्वर से दी हुई सम्पत्ति है और केन्द्रीय सरकार समन्वित आधार पर बिजली की योजनाएं बनाएगी, बाढ़ नियंत्रण की योजनायें बनाएगी, सिंचाई की योजनाएं बनाएगी, किसी प्रदेश को नहीं देगी ।

इसी तरह से जो गलती आपने बेतवा बोर्ड बनाने में की है कि आपने बेतवा बोर्ड तो बनाया, लेकिन सिंचाई का पैसा बोर्ड को सीधा न देकर प्रदेशों को दे दिया और आपका बेतवा बोर्ड प्रदेशों के सामने, मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश के सामने हाथ जोड़कर खड़ा हो जाता है कि आप हमको हमारा पैसा दीजिए और वह प्रदेश अपनी प्राथमिकताओं के अनुसार पैसा दूसरी जगह लगाये रहते हैं । इस तरह से आपका यह विलम्ब हुआ

है और आप भी अगर अब उन पर निगाह नहीं रखेंगे, उन दोनों प्रदेशों पर निगरानी नहीं रखेंगे और उन पर नियंत्रण नहीं रखेंगे, तो फिर यह आपका जो आश्वासन है, यह भी झूठा न पड़ जाए । इस पर भी ध्यान रखने की कृपा करें ।

इसके साथ-साथ हमारे इस सदन के तमाम साथियों ने जो सहयोग दिया है इस प्रस्ताव के ऊपर---प्रस्ताव निश्चित तौर से स्थानीय आधार पर था, लेकिन उसका उद्देश्य इतना व्यापक था कि उसका अलग-अलग प्रदेशों के हमारे साथियों ने उस बड़े उद्देश्य को लेकर उस पर बहस की और उस बड़े उद्देश्य को सामने रख कर हमारी मंत्री जी के सामने विस्तार से उन्होंने चर्चा की । मैं उनका भी आभारी हूं और आभार प्रदर्शित करता हूं ।

इस शब्दों के साथ फिर मैं, मंत्री जी ने जो आश्वासन दिया है, उसको मानते हुए अपने प्रस्ताव को वापिस लेता हूं और मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद देता हूं । इसके साथ ही मैं चाहता हूं कि वह स्वयं जाकर राजघाट की साईट देखें और उस बोर्ड की मीटिंग चाहे झांसी में कर लें, चाहे साईट पर कर लें, तो निश्चित तौर से, क्योंकि उनके दोनों मुख्य मंत्री और सिंचाई मंत्री जी उनके सदस्य हैं, जब एक दफा आप जाकर उसको देख लेंगे, तो सारी कमी जो रही है, वह आपको मालूम हो जाएगी । निश्चित तौर से आपको यह भी पता लग जाएगा कि बोर्ड में मूलभूत जो आपकी कमी रह गई, वह यह रह गई कि पहले आप सिंचाई का हिस्सा पूरा उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को दे देते हैं, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार को दे देते हैं, फिर बोर्ड उनसे मांगता है कि हमारा शेयर दे दीजिए । इस गलती को आप आगे न करें । चाहे जो कोई बोर्ड बनायें, यह ध्यान रखने की कृपा करें ।

मैं फिर आपके प्रति आभार प्रदर्शित करता, हूं और इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ धन्यवाद देता हूं ।

The Bill was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN): Shri Chitta Basu... Not here. Shri Sukomal Sen... Not here. Shri Chaturanan Mishra...Not here. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. ..Not here. Shri K. Vasudeva Paniker...Not here. Shri Suresh Kalmadi...Not here. Shri Sheo Kumar Mishra...Not here. Shri N. B. Balaram... Not here. Shri V. Gopalsamy...Not here.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 3rd August.

The House then adjourned at thirty-eight minutes past three of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 3rd August 1987.